



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,053	09/09/2003	Mark Smith	S0031/7000	4067
42532	7590	02/01/2008		
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			EXAMINER WU, JIANYE	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/01/2008,	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/658,053	Applicant(s) SMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner Jianye Wu	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-5, 8-9, 10-12, 15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by keenan et al (US ^{6,215,789}~~20030072269~~, hereinafter **keenan**).

For **claim 1**, keenan discloses a method for performing time slot switching of synchronous data across an asynchronous medium (FIG. 2) comprising:

(a) converting synchronous serial data related to a source time slot in a time-division multiplexing frame (TDM data from 61 to 59 in FIG. 3) into synchronous parallel data units (data for CBR Slot 1-4 in 70, FIG. 6, with data for each time slot being considered as a data unit;) in accordance with a synchronous clock signal (system mater clock, line 51 of Col. 28) (Notice that (a) is regarding conversion from circuit switched network to packet switched network, which is clearly disclosed either in FIG. 3 or in FIG. 4);

(b) formatting the synchronous parallel data units into a first subpacket (data for

Art Unit: 2616

first 500 μ s containing 2 time slot data units, 70 of FIG. 5) in accordance with the synchronous clock signal, the first subpacket generated during a first synchronization interval of the synchronous clock signal;

(c) generating a packet including the first subpacket (70 of FIG. 5);

(d) asynchronously transmitting the packet across an asynchronous medium (Lines 27-30, Col. 28; or packets transmitted between Ethernet network switches such as traffic between 54 and 56, notice that the medium connecting switches is asynchronous); and

(e) extracting the subpackets from the packet (Line 12-14, col. 28) and storing the subpackets in a plurality of buffers (61 of FIG. 3; or TDM Flow Queue, lines 14-15, col. 28), each of the buffers associated with a destination time slot, the arrangement of subpackets within the buffers being determined by the first synchronization interval during which the subpacket was generated plus a fixed delay offset (line 61-65, Col. 29).

For **claim 2**, it is the corresponding apparatus claim of claim 1, therefore, is rejected for the same reason explained in claim 1 above.

For **claim 3**, keenan discloses a method for transferring data comprising:

(a) packetizing a plurality of synchronous serial data streams (data from 46 to 54 of FIG. 3) into respective subpackets (data indicated by CBR Slot 8 octets in 72 of FIG. 8) during a first synchronization interval, each subpacket associated with a source time slot in a time-division multiplexing frame (time slot indicated by CBR Slot 8 octets in 72 of FIG. 8);

(b) asynchronously transmitting the subpackets through an asynchronous medium (Lines 27-30, Col. 28; or packets transmitted between Ethernet network switches such as traffic between 54 and 56, notice that the medium connecting switches is asynchronous); and

(c) reconverting the subpackets into synchronous data streams (data from 61 to 52 in FIG.3) during a second synchronization interval having a fixed delay (128 μ s, Line 46 of Col. 28) offset relation to the first synchronization interval.

As to **claim 4**, keenan discloses the method of claim 3 wherein (a) comprises:

(a1) converting the synchronous serial data streams into synchronous parallel data units (data units for CBR slot 1-4 in 70 of FIG. 6, the data units are considered as parallel since they are in the same frame and are sent at the same time).

As to **claim 5**, keenan discloses the method of claim 4 wherein (a) comprises:

(a2) formatting the synchronous parallel data units into a respective subpacket during a first synchronization interval (CBR data part of 70 of FIG. 6).

As to **claim 8**, keenan discloses the method of claim 3 wherein (c) comprises:

(c1) extracting the subpackets from the packet (Line 41-44, col. 28), and

(c2) storing the subpackets into a plurality of buffers, each of the buffers buffers (TDM Flow Queue, Line 43, col. 28) associated with a destination time slot, the arrangement of subpackets within the buffers being determined by a value representing the first synchronization interval plus a fixed delay offset (128 μ s, Line 46 of Col. 28).

As to **claim 9**, keenan discloses the method of claim 8 wherein (c) comprises:

(c3) reading the subpackets from the buffers as a plurality of parallel data units

Art Unit: 2616

(data for CBR Slot 1-4 in 70, FIG. 6, with data for each time slot be considered as a data unit); and

(c4) converting the parallel data units into synchronous serial data streams (data from 61 to 52 in FIG.3).

As to **claims 10-12 and 15-16**, they the corresponding apparatus claims of claim 3-5 and 8-9, therefore, are rejected for the same reason explained above.

3. **Claims 17-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ethridge et al. (US 6466572, hereinafter **Ethridge**).

For **claim 17**, Ethridge discloses an apparatus comprising:

(a) an asynchronous switch (66 of Fig. 5);

(b) a plurality of circuit server modules coupled to the asynchronous switch, the server modules comprising (94 of Fig. 5):

(i) a time division multiplex interface (78 or 82 of Fig 4); and

(ii) data adaptation logic (78 or 82 of Fig 4); and

(c) a source of synchronous clock signals (e.g., system clock, 138 of Fig. 7)

coupled to each of the circuit server modules, the synchronous clock signals defining a plurality of synchronization intervals (in fact, circuit server modules inherently associated with a source of synchronous clock signals, which is a common knowledge in the art); the circuit server modules (54 of Fig. 4) configured to perform synchronous time slot switching of synchronous data (data from 56 of Fig. 4) across the asynchronous switch (66 of Fig. 4).

As to **claim 18**, Ethridge discloses the apparatus of claim 17 wherein the time

Art Unit: 2616

division multiplex interface comprises: serial to parallel conversion logic for converting synchronous serial data streams into parallel data units (60 of Fig. 4).

As to **claim 19**, Ethridge discloses the apparatus of claim 17 further comprising: parallel-to-serial conversion logic for converting a plurality of parallel data units into synchronous serial data streams (60 of Fig. 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 6-7, 13-14 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over keenan et al (US ^{6,215,789}~~20030072269~~, hereinafter **keenan**) in view of Luby et al., "Reliable Multicast Transport Building Block: Multirate Congestion Control", draft-ietf-rmt-bb-mrcc-00.txt, July 2000, hereinafter Luby.

As to **claim 6**, keenan discloses the method of claim 5 wherein (b) comprises:

(b1) generating a packet (70 of FIG. 6) from a plurality of subpackets (the

subpacket for CBR data and the subpacket contain packet data in 70 of FIG. 6),

Keenan **is silent on** the packet including data identifying the first synchronization interval during which the subpackets were formatted from the synchronous parallel data units, and a destination time slot identifier associated with each subpacket.

Luby teaches including time slot information (places into each packet the time slot index, Line 10 of Page 8) and other information (Line 7 of Page 8) into each packet.

Keenan and Luby teach the same art, one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine them together for the benefit of providing more information for the receiver.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to to combine them together for the benefit of providing more information for the receiver.

As to **claim 7**, Keenan discloses the method of claim 6 wherein (b) comprises:

(b2) asynchronously transmitting the subpackets through an asynchronous medium as part of the packet (Lines 27-30, Col. 28).

As to **claims 13-14**, they the corresponding apparatus claims of claim 6-7, therefore, are rejected for the same reason explained above.

For **claim 26**, Keenan discloses a memory for storing data to be processed by a data processing system including an asynchronous switch, the memory comprising:

a data structure stored in the memory and usable to perform time slot switching of data (58 of FIG. 3), the data structure comprising:

a plurality of subpackets (FIG. 8), each subpacket associated with a source time slot in a time-division multiplexing frame (TDM data from 61 to 59 in FIG. 3) and

containing parallel data derived from a synchronous serial data stream (data for CBR Slot in 72 of FIG. 8), each subpacket constructed during a common synchronization interval;

Keenan is silent on a synchronization tag identifying the common synchronization interval during which the plurality of subpackets were constructed; data identifying the number of subpackets contained within the data structure; and context data associated with each one of the plurality of subpackets, the context data including a destination time slot identifier corresponding to the source time slot associated with a subpacket.

Luby teaches a synchronization tag (time slot index, Line 10 of Page 8) identifying the common synchronization interval during which the plurality of subpackets were constructed; and other information (Line 7 of Page 8) into each packet; though Luby does not explicitly specify the other information comprising the number of subpackets contained within the data structure and context data, but he suggests implicitly that the packet may contain any data needed.

Keenan and Luby teach the same art, one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine them together for the benefit of providing more information for the receiver.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine them together for the benefit of providing more information for the receiver.

5. **Claims 20-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ethridge as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Keenan and Luby.

As to **claim 20**, Ethridge discloses the apparatus of claim 18 wherein the data adaptation layer comprises:

Ethridge **is silent on** an ingress data memory coupled to the time division multiplexed interface; an ingress context memory; and subpacket construction logic for constructing in the ingress data memory a plurality of subpackets during one of the synchronization intervals, each subpacket associated with a source time slot and containing parallel data derived from a synchronous serial data stream received through the time division multiplexed interface subpacket.

Keenan discloses an ingress data memory (TDM Flow Queue, lines 14-15, Col. 28) coupled to the time division multiplexed interface (38 or 39 of FIG. 3); an ingress context memory (Timing and Control logic, line 18 of Col. 28; or 46 of FIG. 3); and subpacket construction logic (54 of FIG. 3) for constructing in the ingress data memory a plurality of subpackets during one of the synchronization intervals (72 of FIG. 7), each subpacket associated with a source time slot and containing parallel data derived from a synchronous serial data stream (data in CBR Slot, 72 of FIG. 7) received through the time division multiplexed interface subpacket.

Since Ethridge and Keenan teach the same art, one skilled in the art would have motivated to combine them together.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ethridge and Keenan due to obvious industry expedient.

As to **claim 21**, Ethridge discloses the apparatus of claim 20.

Ethridge is silent on wherein the ingress context memory stores context data associated with a subpacket, the context data comprising a destination time slot identifier and a queue identifier associated with a subpacket.

Keenan discloses the context data comprising destination time slot information (CBR slot 1-4, FIG. 5); Luby further discloses the destination time slot identifier (time slot index, line 10 of Page 8) and other information (Line 7 of Page 8) into each packet, as also suggested by Ethridge (Lines 24-27 of Col 13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the context data comprising a destination time slot identifier and a queue identifier for the benefit of providing more detailed information for the receiver.

As to **claim 22**, Ethridge, Keenan and Luby in combination disclose the apparatus of claim 21, Keenan further discloses the data adaptation layer comprises: an ingress queue (TX TDM Flow Queue, 58 of FIG. 3) coupled to the asynchronous switch (59 of FIG. 3); and packet construction logic for constructing in the ingress queue a packet including a plurality of subpackets and the respective context data associated with each subpacket (61 of FIG. 3).

As to **claim 23**, Ethridge, Keenan and Luby in combination disclose the apparatus of claim 22, Luby further discloses wherein the packet further comprises data identifying the synchronization interval during which the subpackets contained therein were constructed (time slot index, line 10 of Page 8).

6. **Claims 24-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ethridge in view of Keenan.

As to **claim 24**, Ethridge discloses the apparatus of claim 17.

Ethridge **is silent on** wherein the data adaptation layer further comprises: an egress data memory having a plurality of playout buffers associated with a plurality of destination time slots; and depacketizing logic for receiving a packet from the asynchronous switch and for storing subpackets contained therein into the plurality of playout buffers in the egress data memory.

Keenan discloses an egress data memory having a plurality of playout buffers associated with a plurality of destination time slots (RX TDM Flow Queue, 58 of FIG. 3); and depacketizing logic for receiving a packet from the asynchronous switch and for storing subpackets contained therein into the plurality of playout buffers in the egress data memory (46 of FIG. 3)

Ethridge and Keenan teach in the same art. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine them for the benefit of providing more functions for users.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ethridge and Keenan for the benefit of providing more functions for users.

As to **claim 25**, Ethridge and Keenan in combination discloses the apparatus of claim 24 Keenan further discloses wherein the data adaptation layer further comprises: playout logic (64 of FIG. 3) for synchronously supplying parallel data (TX TDM Flow Queue, 58 of FIG. 3 and 70 of FIG. 6) from the playout buffers (64 of FIG. 3) to the time division multiplexed interface (61 of FIG. 3).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/11/2007 regarding U.S.C. 102/103 rejections have been fully considered. Response but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments to previous claim rejections are moot because all independent claims (including claims 1-3, 10, 17 and 26) have been amended. New ground rejections based on amended claims are presented in this Office Action above.

2. Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jianye Wu whose telephone number is (571)270-1665. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571)272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jianye Wu

5/31/07



RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER